



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,342	09/26/2003	Hirotoimo Ishii	243324US2S	5069
22850	7590	11/16/2006	EXAMINER	
C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			PATEL, DHARTI HARIDAS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/670,342	Applicant(s) ISHII, HIROTOMO	
	Examiner Dharti H. Patel	Art Unit 2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/26/03</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

DETAILED ACTION

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the acknowledged prior art, in view of Mizuno et al., Publication No. US 2003/0102904A1, and Fliesler et al., Patent No. 6,770,938.

With respect to claim 1, applicant's acknowledged prior art [Fig. 7] teaches a semiconductor integrated circuit that comprises a first circuit block [Fig. 7, 104] including a first power supply terminal [Fig. 1, 102] and a first ground terminal [Fig. 7, 103], a first power supply voltage being applied between the first power supply terminal [Fig. 7, 102] and the first ground terminal [Fig. 7, 103] from a first power domain [Fig. 7, 101]; a second circuit block [Fig. 7, 204] including a second power supply terminal [Fig. 7, 202] and a second ground terminal [Fig. 7, 203], a second power supply voltage being applied between the second power supply terminal [Fig. 7, 202] and the second ground terminal [Fig. 7, 203] from a second power domain [Fig. 7, 201], at least one of the second power supply terminal and the second ground terminal being provided independently of one of the first power supply terminal and the first ground terminal; a propagation circuit [Fig. 7, 401] provided between an output terminal of the first circuit block [Fig. 7,

104] and an input terminal of the second circuit block [Fig. 7, 204] to propagate a signal; and an electrostatic discharge protection circuit [Fig. 7, 601] connected to the first and second power supply terminals [Fig. 7, 102 and 202] and the first and second ground terminals [Fig. 7, 103 and 203, Specification, Page 2, lines 14-21 and Fig. 7]. Applicant's acknowledged prior art [Fig. 10] further teaches that a signal input element [Fig. 10, MP2 or MN2] is connected to the input terminal of the second circuit block [Fig. 10, 204] to which the signal [Fig. 10, 401] is input through the propagation circuit.

However, the prior art fails to teach or suggest a second circuit block that includes a plurality of elements having an equal input withstanding voltage; the first circuit block includes a plurality of elements whose withstanding voltage is equal to or lower than that of the elements of the second circuit block; and a signal input element connected to the input terminal of the second circuit block to which the signal is input through the propagation circuit has an input withstanding voltage which is higher than that of other elements of the second circuit block; and that the ESD protection circuit sets voltage generated between the first power supply terminal and the first ground terminal to be lower than the input withstanding voltage of said plurality of the elements included in the first circuit block.

With respect to the limitation of elements having an equal input withstanding voltage in each block, it is well known in the art the components of a second circuit block of any system must be designed to handle equal or

less withstanding voltage than the output of the first (cascaded) circuit block, otherwise the components of the second circuit block will be damaged due to excessive voltage outputted from the first circuit block. Additionally, the elements in each block must themselves have an equal input withstanding voltage, or damage to those elements can occur.

Mizuno et al. teaches a semiconductor integrated circuit device. Mizuno et al. teaches that the signal input element has an input withstanding voltage, which is higher than that of other elements of the circuit block [Page 8, Paragraph 0090, lines 24-28].

Fliesler teaches an ESD protection circuit for an integrated circuit. Fliesler teaches that when a current due to electrostatic discharge flows between the first power supply terminal and the first ground terminal, the electrostatic discharge protection circuit sets a voltage generated between the first power supply terminal and the first ground terminal to be lower than the input withstanding voltage of said plurality of the elements included in the first circuit block [Col. 2, lines 54-67].

All three teachings are analogous electrostatic discharge protection circuits provided for integrated circuits. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to made to combine the teachings of Mizuno et al. and Fliesler, which teaches an input buffer generally having a high withstanding voltage and ESD voltage being lower than the input withstanding voltage, into the semiconductor device of the applicant's

acknowledged prior art because joint use of the transistors in I/O circuit allows a reduction of the type of MOS transistor gate dielectric used in the overall chip and consequently the cost can be reduced.

With respect to claim 2, applicant's acknowledged prior art teaches that the propagation circuit is a signal line [Fig. 7, 401], which makes a short circuit between the output terminal of the first circuit block [Fig. 7, 104] and the input terminal of the second circuit block [Fig. 7, 204, Specification, Page 2, lines 23-26 and Fig. 7].

With respect to claim 3, applicant's acknowledged prior art teaches that the elements of the second circuit block [Fig. 7, 204] are a plurality of MOS transistors [Specification, Page 6, lines 16-18 and Fig. 10].

With respect to claim 4, applicant's acknowledged prior art [Fig. 10] teaches that the elements of the second circuit block [Fig. 10, 204] are a plurality of MOS transistors but does not disclose that a gate oxide of a MOS transistor that forms a signal input element is thicker than that of another MOS transistor that forms another element. Mizuno et al. teaches that a gate oxide of a MOS transistor that forms a signal input element is thicker than that of another MOS transistor that forms another element [Page 8, Paragraph 0090, lines 24-28].

With respect to claim 5, applicant's acknowledged prior art teaches that the first power supply voltage [Fig. 7, 102] and the second power supply voltage [Fig. 7, 202] are equal to each other [Specification, Page 3, lines 24-26].

Art Unit: 2836

With respect to claim 6, applicant's acknowledged prior art teaches that the first power supply voltage [Fig. 7, 102] and the second power supply voltage [Fig. 7, 202] differ from each other [Specification, Page 3, lines 22-23 and Page 4, lines 1-3].


**Conclusion**

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dharti H. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-8659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus can be reached on 571-272-2800, Ext. 36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DHP  
11/03/2006

  
BRIAN SIRCUS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800